The Russian-language Wikipedia as a Measure of Society Political Mythologization

Abstract

Formation of myths is the first stage of Society Mythologization. The analyzed in this article myth about inheritance rights of Russia to the Kyivan Rus’ arose in the 15th century. Recently this myth is being actively spread by the Russian propaganda in the mass media – in particular this is performed through Wikipedia being one of the most attended Internet resources. The purpose of spreading the myth (the second stage of society mythologization) consists in introduction of a certain idea and certain political behavior into the mass consciousness which would at a certain time point influence the process of making the necessary political decision. The third stage of Society Mythologization is represented as spreading the myth in the process of communication between the authorities and citizens. The manipulative function of the political myth has come into action here; the purpose of this myth consists in activation of separatist sentiments of Russian-speaking Ukrainian citizens.

Purpose – to explore vulnerability of Wikipedia policy of openness on the basis of a specific example as well as to explore its efficiency for formation of political myths; to analyze the technology used for creation of Wikipedia articles in the process of formation of myths.

Methods. Comparison method is applied – texts of Wikipedia articles on various time stages of their creation were compared; results of analyzing Wikipedia pages were correlated to political events of Russian-Ukrainian relations. Formalization technique is applied – representation of the analyzed terms in semiotic and symbolic form; deduction – as a process of drawing a logical conclusion on the basis of the complex of analyzed facts; summarizing.
Results. Mythology not obliged to prove anything and Wikipedia aimed at forming
the concept and creating only an impression of scientifcness and not knowledge as
such are perfectly agreed. That is why Wikipedia is one of the most efficient spreaders
of myths (first of all political myths) supporting a definite ideology.

Keywords: society mythologization, Political myth, formation of myths, Wikipe-
dia, propaganda, mass-media, Kyivan Rus', the Old Rus' State, Moscow-Horde union,
Monomakh's Cap

INTRODUCTION

Political myths do not lose their practical importance in the up-to-date
world and become more and more interesting for scientists who are trying to
describe and to explain the phenomenal viability, adaptability and efficiency of
myths for consolidation of the society.

The recent publications describing influence of the historic mythological
worldview on development of political history and illustrating penetration
of political mythology into the present time include: the work by Mhabeni
Bona researching interrelations between the myth about Monarchical
Exceptionalism and Asian Values (Bona, 2015); the study by Giovanni
C. Cattini about the basic influence of myths on the political culture of
Catalan nationalism (Cattini, 2015); the work by Maribel Fierro (Fierro,
2015) considering political myths as one of sources of literary tropes about
government; the work by Dan Naor (Naor, 2006) considering an example of
resistance myth evolution; the work by Vincent Della Sala (Della Sala, 2016)
analyzing myth as a measure of European Unian social solidarity.

According to Vincent Della Sala, “Scholars of international relations have
extended the concept to argue that states seek security in ways that ensure
a consistency in the narrative sand stories they tell about who they are, what
they do and why. Narratives, including political myths, help provide this
confidence… An important part of the narration of exceptionalism is the
invocation of the ‘virtue’ of the nation” (Della Sala, 2016, p. 3–5).

We could really leave alone historical myths disproved by the modern
science. But realities of the information society are continuously finding
new and new methods for spreading old myths in particular myths which
are ideologically favorable for the up-to-date aggressive policy of Russia.“...
Information should be comprehended not just as a transmission but also as a value system organizing component” (Kovalskyi, 2017, p. 7). And at that scientific disproofs are not as fast as the process of spreading such myths. Wikipedia is one of means used for spreading myths.

Nick Couldry has taken up the position “that digital networks fundamentally change the conditions of politics over the longer term. Without doubt digital networks enable faster political mobilization, accelerated cycles of action, and some new forms of collectivity” (Couldry, 2015).

“Wikipedia is a common access free multilingual on-line encyclopedia working on the basis of the open content principle and giving any user an opportunity to edit pages of this web-site and to update their content in real-time mode… Text of Wikipedia is not checked by any official organizations… As far as Wikipedia may be edited by anybody often one of the main points of criticism is that nobody is responsible for accuracy and completeness of information presented. Wikipedia authors often formulate this as follows: «Verificability» does not mean «the truth» – i.e. Readers and not the encyclopedia are finally responsible for checking truthfulness of articles and they can also form their own interpretations” (Uk.Wikipedia., 2017).

And as far as Wikipedia is one of the most attended web-sites and taking into account the applied organizational policy its importance as one of the best means for spreading myths cannot be overestimated.

**Purpose of the article** – to explore vulnerability of Wikipedia policy of openness on the basis of a specific example as well as to explore its efficiency for formation of political myths; to analyze the technology used for creation of Wikipedia articles in the process of formation of myths.

**Methods.** In the process of performing the proposed research comparison method is applied – texts of Wikipedia articles on various time stages of their creation were subjected to comparison. Also, results of analyzing Wikipedia pages were correlated to political events of Russian-Ukrainian relations. Formalization technique is also applied – representation of the analyzed terms in semiotic and symbolic form; deduction – as a process of drawing a logical conclusion on the basis of the complex of analyzed facts; summarizing.
Myth about Inheritance Rights of Russia to the Kyivan Rus’

The myth about the fact that Russia is the heritor of the Kyivan Rus’ (which was actively promoted during the period of Tsarist Russia, during the Soviet period and which is now promoted in the Russian Federation) is an example of up-to-date political myths.

According to historian and archeographist Yaroslav Dashkevich (Dashkevych, 2011), “Moscow tsars and later on Russian tsars understood that it was impossible to create a great nation and a great empire without a great past. For this purpose, it was necessary to decorate their historical past and even to misappropriate somebody’s else past. That is why Moscow tsars starting from Ivan IV (Ivan the Terrible) (1533–1584) set a task to misappropriate the history of Kyivan Rus’, its glorious past and to create an official mythology of the Russian empire”. Yaroslav Dashkevich reminds: “Yet during the princedom of Vasyl III (1505–1533) an idea of greatness was created in Moscovia; this idea was pitched by the representative of the Moscow Orthodoxy monk Filofey: «Two Romes fell the third Rome stands still and there won’t be a fourth one» From then on Moscovites got an idea of almightiness and God’s favor, that «Moscow is the third and the last Rome»” (Dashkevych 2011).

Many scientists disprove this heritage, in particular Volodymyr Bilinskiy in his novel of research “Country Moksel or Moscovia” analyses facts (taken predominantly from Russian historical sources) and these facts prove “radical distortion of history of the Russian empire aimed at creating a historical mythology about the fact that Moscovia and Kyivan Rus” have common historical roots and that Moscovia has “inheritance rights” to “Kyivan Rus” (Bilins’kyy, 2015).

Yaroslav Dashkevich (Dashkevych, 2011) points out that before the 16th century there are no facts conforming relations between Kyivan Rus’ and the Finnish ethnic group of “Moksel” Land (later Moscow princedom and from 1547 – tsardom). Archaeological excavations performed by O.S. Uvarov confirm that before the 12th century the territory of “Moksel” Land was inhabited only by Finnish tribes – 7729 burial mounds were excavated and no Slavic burials were found: Diversity of multiple findings taken from the
excavated burial grounds give an opportunity to define evident differences between tribes living on these territories and inhabitants of Rus’ (Uvarov, 1872, p. 3). And when in the year of 988 Christianization of Kyivan Rus’ was performed tribes living on the territory of “Moksel” leaded a half-savage life. A number of researchers agree that Moscow prinedom being an ulus of the Golden Horde was founded by Mengu-Timur khan only in 1277 (and by that time Kyivan Rus’ had already existed during a period of more than 300 years).

Mythology about heredity of Russia after Kyivan Rus’ is based on a number of myths. These myths include the story about the fact that Moscow was founded by Yuri Dolgorukiy in 1147 – there are no evidence proving this fact. “Moscow as a settlement was fixed only in 1272 during the third population census of the Golden Horde. Moscow was not mentioned during the first (1237–1238) and the second (1254–1259) censuses” (Dashkevych, 2011).

**The Myth about the Monomakh’s Cap**

Another myth underlying the mythology about Russia as the heritor of Kyivan Rus’ is the myth about the Monomakh’s Cap as a “proof” that Moscow princes were heritors of Kyivan princes and even of Byzantine emperors (this myth appeared at the end of the 15th – beginning of the 16th century).

It is generally known that during the reign of Ivan IV (Ivan the Terrible) Moscovia reinforced its claims to inheritance not only from Kyivan Rus’ but also from the Byzantine Empire. According to this myth the Monomakh’s Cap was allegedly presented to the Kyivan prince Volodymyr Monomakh by his grandfather Konstantin IX [although he had died yet 50 years before Volodymyr became the prince (Valeyeva-Suleymanova, 2008, p. 22)] and that is why it was considered the symbol of power transfer from the Byzantine Empire to Kyivan Rus’. According to the myth taking into account the fact that the first prince Suzdal was the sixth Volodymyr Monomakh’s son Yuri Dolgorukiy possession of this Cap by Moscovia is a “proof” of inheritance rights of Moscow rulers not only to Kyivan Grand-Prince throne but also to the heritage of the former Byzantine Empire. Then the myth tells that a will was drawn up by Volodymyr Monomakh about transfer of “inheritance rights” to Monomakh’s son Yuri Dolgorukiy (Dashkevych, 2011).
If we address Wikipedia we can see that the first version of article “Monomakh’s Cap” dated 18/7/2006 tells: “According to the official state theory (the text is underlined by me – S. Sokolova) this gift of the Byzantine emperor Konstantin Monomakh to the Kyivan prince Volodymyr Vsevolodovich Monomakh had to be viewed as the symbol of succession of power of Russian rulers from Byzantine emperors” (Screenshot 1; Shapka Monomakha 2006). [Note: Here and further on the text cited from Wikipedia is presented as English translation of the respective Russian text and may be absent in the English version of Wikipedia] The article does not present any doubts in this information or any links for confirmation of this theory.


Source: Shapka Monomakha [The Monomakh’s Cap] (2006). Ru.Wikipedia. Publication 18.07.2006. Retrieved (13.05.2017) from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D0%A8-%D0%B0%D0%BF%D0%BA%D0%B0_%D0%9C%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%B0%D1%85%D0%B0&oldid=1504057 (in Russian)

But the modern science has disproved this “state theory”. According to G.F. Valeyeva-Suleymanova:
the myth about the so called Monomakh’s Cap” can be dispelled by means of dispassionate arguments and facts and the only certain fact is that this Cap is a property of the Golden Horde – once a great state… According to our research the Monomakh’s Cap (before it was possessed by Russian princes) was a women’s cap and belonged to a noble Tatar lady… In all likelihood Russian princes obtained the Cap as a result of marriage consolidation with a lady representing a noble Tartar kin (Valeyeva-Suleymanova, 2008, p. 25–26).

According to G. Vernadskiy the Monomakh’s Cap was presented to the Moscow prince Ivan I by the Golden Horde khan Uzbek (grandson of Mengu-Timur, great-great-grandson of Batu-Khan and great-great-great-grandson of Genghis Khan) (Vernadsky, 1953, p. 386).

S.N. Bohatyriov summarizes and concludes that “dynastic headwear of Moscow princes dates back to the Mongol and Turkic tradition of supreme power representation” (Bogatyrev, 2011, p. 193).

Historians are unanimous about the fact that reinterpretation of importance of the Monomakh’s Cap was performed in view of re-orientation of Moscow princedom from the Golden Horde to the Byzantine Empire – the myth about the Monomakh’s Cap first appeared in “Tale of the Princes of Vladimir” approximately in 1518.

And till the present day the Monomakh’s Cap is the symbol of Russian autocracy and is kept in The Armoury Chamber of the Moscow Kremlin. And it is characteristic that this “proof” till the very end was supported on the level of the state (until scientists disproved it absolutely). And that is why the actual (current) version of Wikipedia presents the following information: “Among historians it is widely believed that the Monomakh’s Cap is a relics of the Moscow-Horde union which became the guarantee of the political rise of Moscow in the beginning of the 14th century” (Screenshot 2; Shapka Monomakha, 2017).

But despite the fact that the myth about the Monomakh’s Cap as a “proof” of inheritance of Moscow princes from Kyivan princes was dispelled the myth “About inheritance of Russia from the Kyivan Rus” continues to be cultivated among the Russian-speaking society. The matter is that the Monomakh’s Cap is not mentioned in the disproved context.
Reflection of vector of Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Russian-language Wikipedia

The myth “About inheritance of Russia from the Kyivan Rus” was and is a political myth. Up to date it is one of bases of Russian aggression. “What is critical is that an empire has long-fallen but its cultural patterns remain” (Piszczatowski, 2016, p. 52). In particular at the meeting with Russian historians on 5 November 2014 Volodymyr Putin expressed his clear position that Kyivan Rus’ and Russia are identical concepts. “Yaroslav I (the Wise) [Grand Prince of Kyivan Rus’ (adjustment is made by me – S. Sokolova)] – was wise and did really a lot for the country but he did not organized succession of the throne as it was in some western countries. Formula of throne succession in Russia (the text is underlined by me – S. Sokolova) was very complicated and tangled and so it lead to disunity” (Chervonenko, 2014). That was neither the first nor the last statement of such content made by Russian officials. “Myths and counter-myths in Russian-Ukrainian relations are numerous, expressive and have a strategic nature. The unifying mythologems «common cradle»,
«elder brother», «common Soviet history», «Eurasian idea» are confronted with a conceptual complex of «own truth»: «Originality», «sovereignty of interests», «authenticity», «European orientation». Before the myths have become history they are used as an instrument of struggle. And the «real worth» of competitive mythologizations and demythologizations is finally defined by the historical period” (Pavlyuk, 2008).

The former advisor of president Putin who now works at the Cato Institute (the USA) Andriy Illarionov gives the following characteristics of Putin’s worldview: “He openly thinks that has been given this unique chance to unite these nations under the common state roof. [Note: The game refers to Ukraine, Belarus and Russia]. For him that is a mystic goal which must be achieved… That is why all events in the Crimea and in the East of Ukraine as well as the propaganda war carried out against Ukraine represent the reflection of his worldview which is really disfigured, terrible and which has nothing in common with the reality… I performed the analysis. The Ukrainian war was prepared from 2003… The main target of all these military actions on all levels (by means of conventional methods as well as by hybrid methods) is establishing control over Ukraine, over Kyiv. In this situation Crimea and Donbas are separate instances” (Lashchenko, 2017).

The entire political mythologization of the Russian society being widespread with a help of television, the Internet and other oral and printed mass media makes us recollect also other historical mythologizations and to draw parallels. Unfortunately the history often represents politicians who according to Giovanni C. Cattini, are “resorting to history and myth to justify their own political programmes” (Cattini, 2015, p. 445). For example, “Blumenberg (Blumenberg, 2014) describes Goebbels’ and Hitler’s thinking as deeply rooted in mythical, almost magical ideas of providence and fulfillment: Hitler thought of himself as the promised savior of the German people who came to fulfill what has been announced in the deeds of Alexander the Great, Napoleon or Frederick II of Prussia… In “Prefiguration” Blumenberg… affirms that mythical thought will always have fatal consequences in politics” (Heidenreich, 2015, p. 531).

Up to date the majority of the Russian society share V. Putin’s worldview. On the wave of growing Russian aggression officially proved through “protection of Russian-speaking people” authors of the Russian-language Wikipedia heard position of the Kremlin and in 2014 the term “Kyivan Rus” was removed
Table 1.  
Correlation of terms in the Ru.Wikipedia article “The Old Russian State”.  
Conventional signs A – “Kyivan Rus”, B – “The Old Russian State”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graphic and syntactic representation of the term</th>
<th>Correlation of terms</th>
<th>Screenshot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>THE OLD RUSSIAN STATE was founded…</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>THE OLD RUSSIAN STATE (Kyivan Rus’) was founded…</td>
<td>B: (B ≥ a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2005</td>
<td>The Old Russian State (Kyivan Rus’) was founded…</td>
<td>B: (b ≥ a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2005</td>
<td>The Old Russian State, Kyivan Rus’ was founded…</td>
<td>B: (b = A)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Kyivan Rus’ – the Old Russian State founded…</td>
<td>B: (A ≥ b)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Substitution of terms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Kyivan Rus’ or the Old Russian State… – the middle age state…</td>
<td>B: (A or B)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11.2013</td>
<td>The Old Russian State (Kyivan Rus’)... – the middle age state…</td>
<td>B: (b ≥ a)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11.2013</td>
<td>The Old Russian State... – the middle age state…</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The article tells about A but uses term B instead of A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.12.2013</td>
<td>The Old Russian State... also Kyivan Rus’... – the middle age state…</td>
<td>B: (b = a)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.03.2014</td>
<td>The Old Russian State... – the middle age state…</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The article tells about A but uses term B instead of A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.11.2016 until now</td>
<td>Kyivan Rus’, the Old Russian State, Old Rus’... – the middle age state…</td>
<td>A: (A = B = C)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own elaboration
from the Russian version of Wikipedia and the page was directed to the page “Древнерусское государство” (“The Old Russian State”). A careful observation confirms that the Russian-language Wikipedia is very sensitive to political situation which is illustrated in table 1.

And the following events occurred. In 2002 the Russian-language Wikipedia contained two separate articles:

- a full-value article “Kyivan Rus”,
- a mini-article “The Old Russian State” with a neutralized meaning of Kyiv in the text: 1) concerning unification of cities into a state information about “unification of Novgorod and Kyiv” [Note: The syntactic first place of Novgorod in the sentence defines its priority in the mentioned union.], 2) alongside with Kyiv and Novgorod a number of other equivalent cities is presented: Ladoga, Beloozero, Rostov, Suzdal, Pskov, Polotsk (Screenshot 3).

Screenshot 3.
The Old Russian State (Ru.Wikipedia, 26/12/2002)

Source: Drevnerusskoye gosudarstvo [The Old Russian State] (2016). Ru.Wikipedia. Publication 26.12.2002. Retrieved (13.10.2016) from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D0%94%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%80%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B5_%D0%B3%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B4%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%BE&oldid=41 (in Russian)
In 2004 the term “Kyivan Rus” was added to the article “the Old Russian State” (as the second and equivalent term) (Screenshot 4). In February 2005 this term was italicized and that is a symbol of its minor priority and additionality. The article was supplemented with the most information from the article “Kyivan Rus” with a use of the term itself (Screenshot 5).

Screenshot 4.

Source: Drevnerusskoye gosudarstvo [The Old Russian State] (2016). Ru.Wikipedia. Publication 24.07.2004. Retrieved (13.10.2016) from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D0%94%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%80%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B5_%D0%B3%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B4%D0%B0%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%BE&oldid=19442 (in Russian)
In March 2005 the article “The Old Russian State” was supplemented with almost the complete information from the page about Kyivan Rus’ (Screenshot 6).
In 2006 transposition of terms was performed: The page named “the Old Russian State” received definition and description of “Kyivan Rus” (Screenshot 7). In 2010 the both notions in the subtitle of this page were equalized and the term “Kyivan Rus” was used in paragraphs of the article (Screenshot 8).
Screenshot 7.
The Old Russian State (Ru.Wikipedia, 26.04.2006)

Source: Drevnerusskoye gosudarstvo [The Old Russian State] (2016). Ru.Wikipedia. Publication 26.04.2006 Retrieved (13.10.2016) from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D0%94%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%80%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B5_%D0%B3%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B4%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%BE&oldid=1082074 (in Russian)
On 7/11/2013 the term “Kyivan Rus” disappeared from the section “History” of the article “The Old Russian State” (Screenshot 9). On 13/11/2013 the term “Kyivan Rus” was substituted with “the Old Russian State” (i.e. Substitution of terms was performed) (Screenshot 10). On 28/12/2013 the term “Kyivan Rus” was returned to the article as a synonym (Screenshot 11).
Screenshot 9.
The Old Russian State (Ru.Wikipedia, 7.11.2013)

Source: Drevnerusskoye gosudarstvo [The Old Russian State] (2016). Ru.Wikipedia. Publication 7.11.2013. Retrieved (13.10.2016) from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D0%94%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%80%D1%83%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B5_%D0%B3%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B4%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%BE&oldid=59367867&oldid=59367670 (in Russian)
Screenshot 10.
The Old Russian State (Ru.Wikipedia, 13.11.2013)

Source: Drevnerusskoye gosudarstvo [The Old Russian State] (2016). Ru.Wikipedia. Publication 13.11.2013. Retrieved (13.10.2016) from: https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%D0%94%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%80%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B5_%D0%B3%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B4%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%BE&oldid=59479262 (in Russian)
Correlation of changes in the analyzed articles of Wikipedia with political events appears to be interesting. Domination of the term “the Old Russian State” and disappearance of the term “Kyivan Rus” coincides with cooling in political relations between Ukraine and Russia and with developing aggression under the slogan “unification of Russian lands”.

By the time of creating two separate pages (“Kyivan Rus” and “the Old Russian State”) attempts of separating these two notions were quite obvious: Under the history of “the Old Russian State” we can see description of historical roots of Russia. During 2002–2010 (with significant time intervals between
changes brought to the page) we can notice development of terminology correlation (“the Old Russian State”). When in 2010 a pro-Russian politician Victor Yanukovich became the president of Ukraine thoughts and doubts of authors of the Russian-language Wikipedia were dispelled and the terms “Kyivan Rus” and “the Old Russian State” were presented as identical (i.e. Ukraine and Russia acquired common roots).

A week before Yanukovich’s government announced about suspension of preparation for concluding the Association Agreement with the European Union (Uryad pryynyav rozporyadzhennya..., 2013) the contents of the article named “The Old Russian State” in the Russian-language Wikipedia in fact had become a twin of the article “Kyivan Rus” and that may be perceived as a preparation of combining the articles.

During the period of peaceful opposition (after the Popular Assembly on the EuroMaydan in Kyiv adopted a decision about creating a nationwide organization “Maydan”) (22/12/2013) (Na Yevromaydani..., 2013) after the prime minister of Ukraine Mykola Azarov announced that “Nobody invites Ukraine to the EU” (27/12/2013) (Vopros o vstuplenii..., 2013) the term “Kyivan Rus” was returned as a synonym to the page “the Old Russian State”. This can be viewed upon as an attempt to direct Russian-speaking Ukrainians to the “common historical cradle” (those who had not recognized that)...

On 22 February 2014 the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine dismissed Victor Yanukovych from the post of the President of Ukraine. On 21 March Volodymyr Putin signed the law about ratification of the agreement concerning acceptance of the Republic of Crimea to the Russian Federation. On the same day the medal “For returning Crimea” was founded and on 24 March 2014 the first medals were presented. And precisely in March of that year the article “Kyivan Rus” disappeared from the Russian-language Wikipedia – the search of this article is readdressed to the page “the Old Russian State”. On 24/3/2014 disappointed users wrote in the “Discussion”: “History rewriting is not a good business. During centuries it was named Kyivan Rus’ and now it has become the Old Russian State and then only the Russian Federation will be left...”. And at the same time editors of the Russian-language Wikipedia have refused the request of disappointed users to return the term “Kyivan Rus” (Screenshot 12).
The Internet is full of discussions and comments about the “stolen history” (Kralyuk, 2016; Lohvynenko, 2015; Kiyevskaya Rus’ i Ukraina, 2015 and others) for example:

“Krymnash” (“Crimea is ours”), “Novorossia”, “the Old Russian State”, “historical justice” and collapse of the Soviet Union as a greatest tragedy of the 20th century. We heard all these definitions from the head of the Russian Federation for many times. An entire institute of historians headed by the present Minister of Culture of Russia Volodymyr Medynskiy is now working over justifying the war with Ukraine (Yak Kreml’ perepysuye istoriyu..., 2014).

Only since 18/11/2016 the article is again headed as “Kyivan Rus” and searches of “the Old Russian State” are redirected to the article “Kyivan Rus”. In our opinion the reason of this change is in active and nondecreasing reaction of Wikipedia readers on changes brought to the article (Screenshot 13).
We can conclude that the analyzed materials illustrate that the Russian-language Wikipedia is an operative reflection of the policy conducted by the Russian authorities.

According to Olexander Paliy up to date Ukrainian scientists “are facing the problem of cleaning the Ukrainian history from unconfirmed facts and layers of lie which was deliberately imposed in conditions of total ideological terror when imperial historians could say everything they wanted and for the truth about the Ukrainian history and even for simple learning of this history hundreds of Ukrainian scientists forfeited their career and even their lives”. By means of a detailed analysis of chronicle contents (providing examples as confirmation of all his statements) the researcher proves that authors of ancient chronicles clearly differentiated between the territory of Rus’ and the territory of the present-day Russia. During the period of Kyivan Rus’ Rus’ embraced the territory of the Central Ukraine i.e. The territory of the present-day Kyiv, Chernihiv, Zhytomyr, Sumy regions as well as parts of
Vinnytsia, Cherkasy and Poltava regions. And at the end of the 12th century the center of Rus’ moved to the Western Ukraine (Paliy, 2007).

In response to the needs of the time a small group of Ukrainian historians volunteers created a project named “LIKБЕЗ” (Likbez, 2017). The purpose of the project consists in scientifically grounded disproof of myths, negative stereotypes and evident distortions of Ukrainian history.

In its information contest against society political mythologization organized by Russia web-site N contrasts the myths mentioned in our research with explanation of historical reality facts. In particular, these are such articles as:

- “Myth: Thanks to «Monomakh’s Crown» Moscow princes and tsars were sole «heirs of Rus»” (Galushko, 2014, Mif: Blagodarya “monomakhovomu ventsu”…);
- “Myth: First there was «Kyivan Rus», and then there was «Moscow Rus»” (Galushko, 2014, Mif: Snachala byla “Kiyevskaya Rus”…);
- “Myth: «Rus» and «Russia» are the same thing” (Galushko, 2014, Mif: “Rus” i “Rossiya”…);
- “Myth: Kyivan Rus was inhabited by a sole «old Russian» ethnic group and subsequently in the result of enemy invasions this ethnic group was artificially divided into Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians” (Galushko, 2014, Mif: Kiyevskuyu Rus’ naselyala…);
- “Myth: In the 12th century the political, economic and cultural center of Rus’ was brought from Kyiv to the North-Eastern Rus” (Galushko, 2014, Mif: Mif: V XII veke…).

In these and other articles their authors dispel Moscow myths in a scientific fashion clearly and in layperson terms.

**Conclusion**

During society historical development mythology is continuously finding new and new appearances imposing the necessary worldview to those who are ready to believe these myths and not scientific facts.

Myth is not a fiction. According to Roland Barthes, “myth doesn’t hide things, it distorts them” (Barthes, 1957, p. 202). This characteristic is perfectly matching the format of Wikipedia which is not a scientific source of information.
Wikipedia as a universal and the world biggest encyclopedia is an invaluable invention of the present time as a source of information. It also provides all interested with an opportunity to take part in creation of the world information space. But on the other hand the openness of Wikipedia and practicing an apparent science (and not the real science) is an extremely efficient method for spreading political myths. The function of Wikipedia consists in creation and formation of judgments concerning certain phenomena. And there are no other functions.

According to the policy of Wikipedia these are readers who are responsible for verification of information presented. But during reading Wikipedia average readers often receive doubts because we should recognize that materials not related with political life are presented on the basis of scientific data. So, consciousness of Wikipedia authors appears to be the key element.

We can conclude that mythology presenting generalized concepts and not obliged to prove anything and Wikipedia aimed at forming the concept and creating only an impression of scientificness and not knowledge as such are perfectly agreed and they are as if made for each other. That is why Wikipedia becomes one of the most efficient spreaders of myths (first of all political myths) supporting a definite ideology.

According to the scheme described in the article (thanks to openness of Wikipedia content) by means of substitution of terms and then substitution of notions interested parties have an opportunity to give new lives to political myths. And only attentiveness of scientists and conscious volunteers (readers) can prevent dishonest use of opportunities provided by the modern information space.
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1 The article uses the spelling “Kyivan Rus” which corresponds with the official English transliteration of the name of the capital of Ukraine – “Kyiv” [After the Ukrainian government filed a request to the United States Board on Geographic Names (BGN) the spelling “Kyiv” was unanimously approved on 3 October 2006].